## <u>REMARKS</u>

This Response is made to the Office Action dated May 10, 2010. Claims 1-5 are pending. Applicants have carefully reviewed the arguments presented in the Office Action and respectfully request reconsideration of the claims in view of the remarks presented below.

Claims 1-5 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103 (a) as being unpatentable over U.S. Patent No. 6,599307 to Huter et al. (the "Huter patent") in view of U. S. Patent No. 6,277,138 to Levinson et al. (the "Levinson patent"). Applicants respectfully point out to the Examiner that the Huter patent does not constitute prior art to the pending application. The present application is a divisional application based on Application Serial No. 09/727,102 which was filed on **November 28, 2000**. The Huter patent was filed on **July 31, 2001** and is a continuation-in-part of Application Serial No. 09/896,142 filed on **June 29, 2001**. Accordingly, the Huter patent does not constitute a prior art reference to the present application. Accordingly, Applicants respectfully request the Examiner to withdraw the obviousness rejections raised against claims 1-5..

In view of the foregoing, it is respectively urged that all of the present claims of the application are patentable and in a condition for allowance. The undersigned attorney can be reached at (310) 824-5555 to facilitate prosecution of this application, if necessary.

Response filed August 6, 2010 In response to the Office Action dated May 10, 2010

Applicants believe that no fee is required. The Commissioner is authorized, however, to charge any fees that may be required by this paper to Deposit Account No. 06-2425.

Respectfully submitted, FULWIDER PATTON LLP

/Thomas H. Majcher/ Thomas H. Majcher Registration No. 31,119

THM

412726.1